

## II. REVIEW OF CERTIFICATIONS [REDACTED]

The Court must review a certification submitted pursuant to Section 702 of FISA “to determine whether [it] contains all the required elements.” 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(2)(A). The Court’s examination of Certifications [REDACTED] confirms that:

(1) the certifications have been made under oath by the Attorney General and the DNI, as required by 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(1)(A), see Certification [REDACTED]

(2) the certifications contain each of the attestations required by 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(A), see Certification [REDACTED];

(3) as required by 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(B), each of the certifications is accompanied by the applicable targeting procedures<sup>7</sup> and minimization procedures;<sup>8</sup>

(4) each of the certifications is supported by the affidavits of appropriate national security officials, as described in 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(C);<sup>9</sup> and

(5) each of the certifications includes an effective date for the authorization in compliance

---

<sup>7</sup> See April 2011 Submissions, NSA Targeting Procedures and FBI Targeting Procedures (attached to Certifications [REDACTED]).

<sup>8</sup> See April 2011 Submissions, NSA Minimization Procedures, FBI Minimization Procedures, and CIA Minimization Procedures (attached to Certifications [REDACTED]).

<sup>9</sup> See April 2011 Submissions, Affidavits of John C. Inglis, Acting Director, NSA (attached to Certifications [REDACTED]); Affidavit of Gen. Keith B. Alexander, U.S. Army, Director, NSA (attached to Certification [REDACTED]); Affidavits of Robert S. Mueller, III, Director, FBI (attached to Certifications [REDACTED]);

with 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(D), see Certification [REDACTED]

<sup>10</sup>

The Court therefore finds that Certification [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] contain all the required elements. 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(2)(A).

III. REVIEW OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CERTIFICATIONS IN THE PRIOR DOCKETS.

Under the judicial review procedures that apply to amendments by virtue of Section 1881a(i)(1)(C), the Court must review each of the amended certifications “to determine whether the certification contains all the required elements.” 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(2)(A). The Court has previously determined that the certifications in each of the Prior 702 Dockets, as originally submitted to the Court and previously amended, contained all the required elements.<sup>11</sup> Like the prior certifications and amendments, the amendments now before the Court were executed under oath by the Attorney General and the DNI, as required by 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(1)(A), and submitted to the Court within the time allowed under 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(1)(C). See

---

<sup>10</sup> The statement described in 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(E) is not required in this case because there has been no “exigent circumstances” determination under Section 1881a(c)(2).

<sup>11</sup> [REDACTED]

Certification [REDACTED]<sup>12</sup> Pursuant to Section 1881a(g)(2)(A)(ii), the latest amendments include the attestations of the Attorney General and the DNI that the accompanying NSA and CIA minimization procedures meet the statutory definition of minimization procedures, are consistent with the requirements of the Fourth Amendment, and will be submitted to the Court for approval. Certification [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. The latest amendments also include effective dates that comply with 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(g)(2)(D) and § 1881a(i)(1).

Certification [REDACTED] All other aspects of the certifications in the Prior 702 Dockets – including the further attestations made therein in accordance with § 1881a(g)(2)(A), the NSA targeting procedures and FBI minimization procedures submitted therewith in accordance with § 1881a(g)(2)(B),<sup>13</sup> and the affidavits executed in support thereof in accordance with § 1881a(g)(2)(C) – are unaltered by the latest amendments.

In light of the foregoing, the Court finds that the certifications in the Prior 702 Dockets, as amended, each contain all the required elements. 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(2)(A).

---

<sup>12</sup> The amendments to the certifications in the Prior 702 Dockets were approved by the Attorney General on April 11, 2011, and by the DNI on April 13, 2011. See Certification [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

<sup>13</sup> Of course, targeting under the certifications filed in the Prior 702 Dockets will no longer be permitted following the Court's issuance of an order on Certifications [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



#### IV. REVIEW OF THE TARGETING AND MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES

The Court is required to review the targeting and minimization procedures to determine whether they are consistent with the requirements of 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(d)(1) and (e)(1). See 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(2)(B) and (C); see also 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(1)(C) (providing that amended procedures must be reviewed under the same standard). Section 1881a(d)(1) provides that the targeting procedures must be “reasonably designed” to “ensure that any acquisition authorized under [the certification] is limited to targeting persons reasonably believed to be located outside the United States” and to “prevent the intentional acquisition of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are known at the time of the acquisition to be located in the United States.” Section 1881a(e)(1) requires that the minimization procedures “meet the definition of minimization procedures under [50 U.S.C. §§] 1801(h) or 1821(4) . . . .” Most notably, that definition requires “specific procedures, which shall be adopted by the Attorney General, that are reasonably designed in light of the purpose and technique of the particular [surveillance or physical search], to minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information.” 50 U.S.C. §§ 1801(h) & 1821(4). Finally, the Court must determine whether the targeting and minimization procedures are consistent with the requirements of the Fourth Amendment. 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(i)(3)(A).

A. The Effect of the Government's Disclosures Regarding NSA's Acquisition of Internet Transactions on the Court's Review of the Targeting and Minimization Procedures

The Court's review of the targeting and minimization procedures submitted with the April 2011 Submissions is complicated by the government's recent revelation that NSA's acquisition of Internet communications through its upstream collection under Section 702 is accomplished by acquiring Internet "transactions," which may contain a single, discrete communication, or multiple discrete communications, including communications that are neither to, from, nor about targeted facilities. June 1 Submission at 1-2. That revelation fundamentally alters the Court's understanding of the scope of the collection conducted pursuant to Section 702 and requires careful reexamination of many of the assessments and presumptions underlying its prior approvals.

In the first Section 702 docket, [REDACTED], the government disclosed that its Section 702 collection would include both telephone and Internet communications. According to the government, the acquisition of telephonic communications would be limited to "to/from" communications – *i.e.*, communications to or from a tasked facility. The government explained, however, that the Internet communications acquired would include both to/from communications and "about" communications – *i.e.*, communications containing a reference to the name of the tasked account. See [REDACTED]. Based upon the government's descriptions of the proposed collection, the Court understood that the acquisition of Internet communications under Section 702 would be limited to discrete "to/from" communications between or among individual account users and to "about"

~~TOP SECRET//COMINT//ORCON,NOFORN~~

communications falling within [REDACTED] specific categories that had been first described to the Court in prior proceedings. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The Court's analysis and ultimate approval of the targeting and minimization procedures in Docket No. [REDACTED], and in the other [REDACTED] Prior 702 Dockets, depended upon the government's representations regarding the scope of the collection. In conducting its review and granting those approvals, the Court did not take into account NSA's acquisition of Internet transactions, which now materially and fundamentally alters the statutory and constitutional analysis.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The Court is troubled that the government's revelations regarding NSA's acquisition of Internet transactions mark the third instance in less than three years in which the government has disclosed a substantial misrepresentation regarding the scope of a major collection program.

In March, 2009, the Court concluded that its authorization of NSA's bulk acquisition of telephone call detail records from [REDACTED] in the so-called "big business records" matter "ha[d] been premised on a flawed depiction of how the NSA uses [the acquired] metadata," and that "[t]his misperception by the FISC existed from the inception of its authorized collection in May 2006, buttressed by repeated inaccurate statements made in the government's submissions, and despite a government-devised and Court-mandated oversight regime." Docket No. BR 08-13, March 2, 2009 Order at 10-11. Contrary to the government's repeated assurances, NSA had been routinely running queries of the metadata using querying terms that did not meet the required standard for querying. The Court concluded that this requirement had been "so frequently and systemically violated that it can fairly be said that this critical element of the overall . . . regime has never functioned effectively." *Id.*

Shortly thereafter, the government made a similar disclosure regarding NSA's bulk acquisition of metadata regarding Internet communications in the so-called "big pen register" matter. In [REDACTED] the government reported that, from the time of the initial Court authorization [REDACTED], NSA had been continually collecting various forms of data falling outside the scope of the Court's orders, and that "[v]irtually every PR/TT record' generated by this program included some data that had not been authorized for collection." Docket No. PR/TT [REDACTED] Mem. Op. at 20-21. This long-running and systemic overcollection had

(continued...)

~~TOP SECRET//COMINT//ORCON,NOFORN~~

The government's submissions make clear not only that NSA has been acquiring Internet transactions since before the Court's approval of the first Section 702 certification in 2008,<sup>15</sup> but also that NSA seeks to continue the collection of Internet transactions. Because NSA's acquisition of Internet transactions presents difficult questions, the Court will conduct its review in two stages. Consistent with the approach it has followed in past reviews of Section 702 certifications and amendments, the Court will first consider the targeting and minimization procedures as applied to the acquisition of communications other than Internet transactions – i.e., to the discrete communications between or among the users of telephone and Internet communications facilities that are to or from a facility tasked for collection.<sup>16</sup> The Court will

---

<sup>14</sup>(...continued)

occurred despite the government's repeated assurances over the course of nearly [REDACTED] years that [REDACTED] the authorizations granted by docket number PR/TT [REDACTED] and previous docket numbers only collect, or collected, authorized metadata." Id. at 20. The overcollection was not detected by NSA until after an "end-to-end review" of the PR/TT metadata program that had been completed by the agency on August 11, 2009. Id.

<sup>15</sup> The government's revelations regarding the scope of NSA's upstream collection implicate 50 U.S.C. § 1809(a), which makes it a crime (1) to "engage[] in electronic surveillance under color of law except as authorized" by statute or (2) to "disclose[] or use[] information obtained under color of law by electronic surveillance, knowing or having reason to know that the information was obtained through electronic surveillance not authorized" by statute. See [REDACTED] (concluding that Section 1809(a)(2) precluded the Court from approving the government's proposed use of, among other things, certain data acquired by NSA without statutory authority through its "upstream collection"). The Court will address Section 1809(a) and related issues in a separate order.

<sup>16</sup> As noted, the Court previously authorized the acquisition of [REDACTED] categories of "about" communications. The Court now understands that all "about" communications are acquired by means of NSA's acquisition of Internet transactions through its upstream collection. See June 1 Submission at 1-2, see also Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 76. Accordingly, the Court considers the (continued...)



then assess the effect of the recent disclosures regarding NSA's collection of Internet transactions on its ability to make the findings necessary to approve the certifications and the NSA targeting and minimization procedures.<sup>17</sup>

B. The Unmodified Procedures

The government represents that the NSA targeting procedures and the FBI minimization procedures filed with the April 2011 Submissions are identical to the corresponding procedures that were submitted to the Court in Docket Nos. [REDACTED]<sup>18</sup>

The Court has reviewed each of these sets of procedures and confirmed that is the case. In fact, the NSA targeting procedures and FBI minimization procedures now before the Court are copies

---

<sup>16</sup>(...continued)

[REDACTED] categories of "about" communications to be a subset of the Internet transactions that NSA acquires. The Court's discussion of the manner in which the government proposes to apply its targeting and minimization procedures to Internet transactions generally also applies to the [REDACTED] categories of "about" communications. See infra, pages 41-79.

<sup>17</sup> The FBI and the CIA do not receive unminimized communications that have been acquired through NSA's upstream collection of Internet communications. Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61-62. Accordingly, the discussion of Internet transactions that appears below does not affect the Court's conclusions that the FBI targeting procedures, the CIA minimization procedures, and the FBI minimization procedures meet the statutory and constitutional requirements.

<sup>18</sup> See Government's Ex Parte Submission of Reauthorization Certification and Related Procedures, Ex Parte Submission of Amended Certifications, and Request for an Order Approving Such Certification and Amended Certifications for DNI/AG 702(g) Certifications [REDACTED]; Government's Ex Parte Submission of Reauthorization Certification and Related Procedures, Ex Parte Submission of Amended Certifications, and Request for an Order Approving Such Certification and Amended Certifications for DNI/AG 702(g) Certifications [REDACTED]; Government's Ex Parte Submission of Reauthorization Certification and Related Procedures, Ex Parte Submission of Amended Certifications, and Request for an Order Approving Such Certification and Amended Certifications for DNI/AG 702(g) Certifications [REDACTED].



of the procedures that were initially filed on July 29, 2009, in Docket No. [REDACTED]<sup>19</sup> The Court found in those prior dockets that the targeting and minimization procedures were consistent with the requirements of 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(d)-(e) and with the Fourth Amendment. See Docket No. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The Court is prepared to renew its past findings that the NSA targeting procedures (as applied to forms of to/from communications that have previously been described to the Court) and the FBI minimization procedures are consistent with the requirements of 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(d)-(e) and with the Fourth Amendment.<sup>20</sup>

C. The Amended Procedures

As noted above, the FBI targeting procedures and the NSA and CIA minimization procedures submitted with the April 2011 Submissions differ in a number of respects from the corresponding procedures that were submitted by the government and approved by the Court in connection with Certifications [REDACTED]. For the reasons that follow, the Court finds that, as applied to the previously authorized collection of discrete communications to or from a tasked facility, the amended FBI targeting procedures and the amended NSA and CIA

---

<sup>19</sup> Copies of those same procedures were also submitted in Docket Nos. [REDACTED]

<sup>20</sup> The Court notes that the FBI minimization procedures are not “set forth in a clear and self-contained manner, without resort to cross-referencing,” as required by FISC Rule 12, which became effective on November 1, 2010. The Court expects that future submissions by the government will comport with this requirement.

minimization procedures are consistent with the requirements of 50 U.S.C. § 1881a(d)-(e) and with the Fourth Amendment.

1. The Amended FBI Targeting Procedures

The government has made three changes to the FBI targeting procedures, all of which involve Section I.4. That provision requires the FBI, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The new language proposed by the government would allow the FBI to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The government has advised the Court that this change was prompted by the fact that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Nevertheless, the current procedures require the FBI to [REDACTED]. The change is intended to eliminate the requirement of [REDACTED].

The second change, reflected in subparagraph (a) of Section I.4, would allow the FBI, under certain circumstances, to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]